



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/746,953	12/22/2000	Robert James Laferriere	GEMS:0110/YOD (15-SV-5653)	1242

7590 11/05/2003
Patrick S. Yoder
Suite 330
7915 FM 1960 West
Houston, TX 77070

EXAMINER

TRAN, LAMBERT L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

3

DATE MAILED: 11/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/746,953

Applicant(s)

LAFERRIERE ET AL.

Examiner

Lambert L. Tran

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 December 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Action is in response to the application filed on 22 December 2000.

Priority

2. No claim for priority has been made in this application.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 22 December 2000 (paper #2) has been considered by the Examiner (see attached PTO 1449).

Drawings

4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description: Reference numeral 90 in figure 6. A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 2142

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brinegar et al., U.S. Patent No 5,940,082, hereinafter referred to as Brinegar, in view of Huang et al., U.S. Patent No 6,438,576, hereinafter referred to as Huang.

7. In regard to claims 1, 11, 20, 24, Brinegar disclosed: *a method for controlling (managing) operation of a controlled computer via a controlling computer in a collaborative environment, the method comprising the steps of:*
displaying an interface screen (shared drawing, virtual white board) at a controlled computer based upon a program run by the controlled computer [see Brinegar, ABSTRACT];
transmitting screen data representative of the screen for display at a controlling computer coupled to the controlled computer via a network [see Brinegar, col. 3, lines 1-9];
transmitting input event data from the controlling computer to the controlled computer via the network [see Brinegar, col. 3, lines 1-9, and col. 3, lines 40-44];
executing a command based upon the input event data (edit, erase) [see Brinegar, col. 3, lines 2-4];
designating a portion of the screen at the controlled computer based upon the input event data and the program [see Brinegar, col. 2, lines 59-67];
caching the portion of the screen at the controlling (drawing repository) [see Brinegar, col. 3, lines 66-67].

8. However, Brinegar did not disclose *caching at the controlled computer*. In the same field of collaborative computing [see Huang, col. 1, lines 20-25], Huang disclosed: a cache manager which maintains a local copy of the objects at the (server) controlled computer [see Huang, col.

Art Unit: 2142

6, lines 64-67]. An ordinary artisan in the art at the same time the invention was made, would have been motivated to look for an efficient methodology for quickly relaying graphical images to the participants (controlling computers) [see Brinegar, col. 1, lines 23-24].

9. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the collaborative computing art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Brinegar's teachings of managing a distributed collaborative design [see Brinegar, col. 1, lines 5-6] with the teachings of Huang, for the purpose of providing a system that is more robust, with the goal is to optimize a given objective function using the associated information (cached information) as parameters [see Huang, col. 8, lines 54-56].

10. For the rationale set forth above, claims 1, 11, 20, 24 are rejected.

11. In regard to claims 2, 26, Huang disclosed:
cached at least the data corresponding to the logical block at the controlled computer [see Huang, col. 6, lines 63-67].

12. In regard to claims 3, 7, 12-13, 21, Brinegar disclosed:
data corresponding to the logical block includes data representative of coordinates of a perimeter of the logical block (position data points, curve descriptors) [see Brinegar, col. 13, lines 36-51].

13. In regard to claims 4, 27, Huang disclosed:
the program is resident at and is run on the controlled computer (server) [see Huang, col. 5, lines 42-65, and col. 12, lines 9-15].

14. In regard to claims 5, 6, 10, 18, 25, 28, the combination inventions Brinegar and Huang disclosed:

Art Unit: 2142

input device; a computer mouse; graphical command device; graphical input device; a controlled device [see Brinegar, col. 3, lines 39-44, see Huang, col. 5, lines 42-65].

15. In regard to claim 8, the combination inventions Brinegar and Huang disclosed: *executing an instruction via the controlled computer based upon the input event* (edit) [see Brinegar, col. 3, lines 1-4, see Huang, col. 9, lines 56-66].

16. In regard to claims 9, 17, Brinegar disclosed: *the logical block includes a display window* [see Brinegar, col. 5, lines 5-22].

17. In regard to claims 14, 22, Brinegar disclosed: *the portion of the screen is cached at the controlling computer* (drawing repository) [see Brinegar, col. 3, lines 66-67].

18. In regard to claims 15-16, 23, the combination inventions Brinegar and Huang disclosed: *computer background data; background data is referenced to fill; background data representative of a portion of a screen beneath the portion* (all graphic images, processing the object to conform with the capabilities of the requestor) [see Brinegar, col. 5, lines 5-8, see Huang, col. 12, 9-37].

19. In regard to claim 19, Brinegar disclosed: *network includes the Internet* [see Brinegar, col. 2, lines 49-52].

20. In regard to claim 29, the combination inventions Brinegar and Huang disclosed: *a plurality of controlling computers linked to the controlled computer via the network, each controlling computer including a cache memory for storing the portions of the interface screen* [see Brinegar, col. 4, lines 57-67, col. 5, lines 1-9, see Huang, col. 12, lines 9-36].

Art Unit: 2142

21. Since all the claims limitations are met by the combination inventions Brinegar and Huang, claims 1-29 are rejected.

22. Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates et al., U.S. Patent No 5,515,491, hereinafter referred to as Bates, in view of Curtis et al., U.S. Patent No 6,338,086, hereinafter referred to as Curtis.

23. In regard to claims 1, 11, 20, 24, Bates disclosed: *a method for controlling (management of communications) operation of a controlled computer via a controlling computer in a collaborative environment, the method comprising the steps of:*
displaying an interface screen (display device, shared data object) at a controlled computer based upon a program run by the controlled computer [see Bates, ABSTRACT, and col. 9, lines 17-21];
transmitting screen data representative of the screen for display at a controlling computer coupled to the controlled computer via a network [see Bates, col. 9, lines 2-13];
transmitting input event data from the controlling computer to the controlled computer via the network [see Bates, col. 5, lines 33-42, and col. 12, lines 3-9];
designating a portion of the screen at the controlled computer based upon the input event data and the program [see Bates, col. 3, lines 19-24];
caching the portion of the screen at the controlling and controlled computer [see Bates, col. 5, line 15, and col. 12, line 1];
executing a command based upon the input event data (edit) [see Bates, col. 12, lines 3-9].

24. In regard to claims 2, 26, Bates disclosed:

Art Unit: 2142

caching at least the data corresponding to the logical block at the controlled computer [see Bates, col. 5, line 15].

25. In regard to claims 3, 7, 12-13, 21, Bates disclosed:

data corresponding to the logical block includes data representative of coordinates of a perimeter of the logical block [see Bates, col. 10, lines 59-67].

26. In regard to claims 4, 27, Bates disclosed:

the program is resident at and is run on the controlled computer (server) [see Bates, ABSTRACT, and col. 9, lines 17-21];

27. In regard to claims 5, 6, Bates disclosed:

input device; a computer mouse [see Bates, col. 9, lines 29-31].

28. In regard to claims 10, 18, 25, 28, Bates disclosed the invention substantially as claimed.

However, Bates did not disclose: *graphical command device; graphical input device; a controlled device*. In the same field of collaborative computing [see Curtis, ABSTRACT], Curtis disclosed: *graphical command device; graphical input device; a controlled device* (alphanumeric input device, user input device with cursor control) [see Curtis, col. 3, lines 17-24, and Figure 1].

An ordinary artisan in the art at the same time the invention was made, would have been motivated to look for a way to enhance cooperative work in a collaborative computer system [see Bates, col. 3, lines 1-3].

29. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the collaborative computing art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Bates' teachings with the teachings of Curtis, for the purpose of providing concurrency control of objects with more natural, real-time response [see Curtis, col. 12, lines 1-3].

Art Unit: 2142

30. For the rationale set forth above, claims 10, 18, 25, 28 are rejected.

31. In regard to claim 8, Bates disclosed: *executing an instruction via the controlled computer based upon the input event (cursor movement)* [see Bates, col. 15, lines 3-24].

32. In regard to claims 9, 17, Bates disclosed: *the logical block includes a display window* [see Bates, col. 59, lines 29-32].

33. In regard to claims 14, 22, Bates disclosed: *the portion of the screen is cached at the controlling computer (client memory)* [see Bates, col. 12, line 1].

34. In regard to claims 15-16, 23, Bates disclosed:
computer background data; background data is referenced to fill; background data representative of a portion of a screen beneath the portion [see Bates, col. 7, lines 59-61].

35. In regard to claim 19, Curtis disclosed: *network includes the Internet* [see Curtis, col. 1, lines 33-40].

36. In regard to claim 29, Bates disclosed:
a plurality of controlling computers linked to the controlled computer via the network, each controlling computer including a cache memory for storing the portions of the interface screen [see Bates, ABSTRACT, col. 3, lines 19-30, col. 5, line 15, and col. 12, line 1].

37. Since all the claims limitations are met by the combination inventions Bates and Curtis, claims 1-29 are rejected.

Conclusion

38. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a. Harple et al., U.S. Patent No 6,195,091, disclosed apparatus for collaborative computing.
- b. Hao et al., U.S. Patent No 5,844,553, disclosed mechanism to control and use window events among applications in concurrency computing.
- c. Nakayama et al., U.S. Patent No 5,872,924, disclosed collaborative work support system.
- d. Carey et al., U.S. Patent No 5,821,925, disclosed collaborative work environment supporting three-dimensional objects and multiple remote participants.
- e. Hester, U.S. Patent No 5,608,426, disclosed palette management for application sharing in collaborative systems.
- f. Katsurabayashi et al., U.S. Patent No 5,996,002, disclosed collaborative work support system and method to facilitate the process of discussion in a meeting using a shared window.
- g. Simonoff et al., U.S. Patent No 6,463,460, disclosed interactive communication system permitting increased collaboration between users.
- h. Prabhakaran, B., "Resource Negotiation For Collaborative Multimedia Presentations", IEEE International Conference On Multimedia Computing and Systems, June, 1999, pp 36-40.

Art Unit: 2142

- i. Menges, J. and Jeffay, K., "Inverting X: An Architecture for a Shared Distributed Window System", IEEE Third Workshop on Enabling Technologies: Infrastructure for Collaborative Enterprises, Proceedings, April, 1994, pp 53-64.

39. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lambert L. Tran whose telephone number is (703) 305-4663.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F at 9AM - 5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on (703) 308-5221. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9700.

L.L.T
Assistant Examiner
GAU 2142
October 29, 2003

Marc Thompson
Primary Examiner
(703) 308-6750

MARC D. THOMPSON
MARC THOMPSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER